

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner also objected to the drawings due to minor informalities. The Examiner further objected to the specification due to informalities in the abstract.

The Examiner objected to claims 1-29 due to minor informalities. The Examiner also objected to claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite. Further, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16, 18-22, and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hartmann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,810,427). Additionally, the Examiner rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Hartmann et al. in view of Horansky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,995,660). Moreover, the Examiner objected to claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Hartmann et al. in view of Poertzen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,307). Each of these rejections is addressed individually below.

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 17, 25, and 28, which are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Objections To The Drawings:

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the drawings. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the "elastomeric coupling" (claim 20) and the "shock mounting system" (claim 24) are not shown in the drawings. Claims 20 and 24 have been cancelled without prejudice.

The Examiner also objected to the drawings due to minor informalities. Specifically, the Examiner identified certain reference number corrections that were required. The Applicant is submitting proposed corrected drawings curing these informalities. It is therefore submitted that the objections to the drawings have been overcome and should therefore be withdrawn.

The Objections To the Specification:

The Examiner objected to the abstract of the disclosure due to minor informalities. The Applicant has corrected these informalities in the abstract and therefore submits that these objections should therefore be withdrawn.

The Claim Objections:

The Examiner objected to claims 1-29 due to minor typographical informalities. These claim informalities have been corrected as set forth above. It is respectfully submitted that the objections to the claims have been overcome.

The Section 112 Claim Rejections:

The Examiner rejected claims 29 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 29 has been amended above to overcome the indefiniteness rejection.

It is therefore submitted that the section 112, second paragraph rejections have been overcome and that these rejections should therefore be withdrawn.

The Section 102(b) Claim Rejections:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16, 18-22, and 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Hartmann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,810,427). Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of allowed claim 17.

It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance and that claims 2-16, 18-19, 21-23, and 25-29, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for the same reason.

It is also submitted that newly added claim 30, which rewrites allowable claim 25 in independent form, is also allowable.


Conclusion:

It is respectfully submitted that all objections and rejections of record have been overcome and that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is therefore earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner should have any questions, she is urged to contact the undersigned at 248-223-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.



John S. Artz
Reg. No. 36,431
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Date: November 24, 2004